UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-NINTH YEAR

2540th MEETING: 21 MAY 1984

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2540) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 17 May 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16569) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2540th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 21 May 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Oleg A. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2540)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Middle East:
   Letter dated 17 May 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16569)

The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 17 May 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16569)

1. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Kuwait and Lebanon in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 17 May 1984 from the representative of Egypt [*S/16571*], which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation to Mr. Zehdi Labib Terzi, Permanent Observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations, to participate in the deliberations of the Council on the item entitled 'The situation in the Middle East', in accordance with the Council's usual practice."

3. The proposal of the representative of Egypt is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, but, if approved by the Council, the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the same rights of participation as those of a Member State when invited to participate pursuant to rule 37. Does any member of the Council wish to speak on this proposal?

4. Mr. SORZANO (United States of America): The United States opposes extending to the PLO the same rights to participate in the proceedings of the Council as if that organization represented a Member State. We have consistently taken the position that, under the provisional rules of procedure, the only legal basis on which the Council may grant a hearing to persons speaking on behalf of non-governmental entities is rule 39. For 35 years the United States has supported a generous interpretation of rule 39 and would not object in this case. We are, however, opposed to special *ad hoc* departures from orderly procedure. In particular, the United States does not agree with the recent practice of the Council which appears selectively to try to enhance the prestige of those who wish to speak in the Council through a departure from the rules of procedure. We consider this special practice to be without legal foundation and to constitute an abuse of the rules. For these reasons the United States requests that you, Mr. President, put the terms of the proposed invitation to the vote. The United States will vote against.

5. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: If no other member of the Council wishes to speak at this stage, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the proposal of Egypt.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: China, Egypt, India, Malta, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: France, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.

6. Mr. SERRY (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation has abstained in the vote on the participation by the PLO in the Council's debate. In so doing my delegation does, however, certainly not wish to convey the impression that in our view the representative of the PLO should not be heard by the Council. My delegation is moved by the concern that the Council should be guided by the rules of procedure it has set itself.

7. Members of the Council will be aware that my country, together with the other States of the European Community, has expressed the view that the Middle East can enjoy true peace and lasting stability only through a comprehensive settlement to be concluded with the participation of all parties concerned, which means that the PLO will have to be associated with negotiations.

8. My delegation therefore welcomes the participation of the PLO in the present debate. Our reservations relate only to the procedure followed. This is clearly designed to grant the PLO, admitted to the General Assembly as an observer, a status similar to that of a Member State. This is a gesture of a political nature which does not reflect the true relationship of the PLO to the United Nations and which we, therefore, cannot support.

9. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 21 May 1984 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request that I be allowed to participate in the Security Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in the Middle East', in accordance with the provisions of rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, in my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People."

10. On previous occasions, the Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sarré (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

11. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: The Security Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in the letter dated 17 May 1984 from the representative of Kuwait to the President of the Council [*S/16569*].

12. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following other documents: document S/16568, which contains the text of a letter dated 16 May 1984 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to the Secretary-General, and document S/16570, which contains the text of a letter dated 17 May 1984 from the representative of Egypt to the President of the Security Council.

13. The first speaker is the representative of Kuwait, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as the Chairman of the Group of Arab States for the month of May. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

14. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: Mr. President, first may I congratulate you on your accession to the presidency of the Council for this month and to take the same opportunity to express to you the appreciation of the Group of Arab States, which I have the honour of presiding over for this month, and also the particular appreciation of my delegation for your extreme wisdom and well recognized skill in directing the work of the Council in a spirit of integrity, skill and objectivity, and also for the support which your friendly and great country has been giving to the Arab cause.

15. Similarly, it is my privilege and pleasure to pay a tribute to the skill shown by your predecessor, the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, who directed the work of the Council last month.

16. I should also like to convey to you and to all the members of the Council, my delegation's thanks for giving us this opportunity to speak before you today on behalf of the Group of Arab States at the United Nations on the important item which we have met to discuss.

17. On 15 May, Israel committed a further horrific crime when more than 1,500 troops from the Israeli occupation forces surrounded the Palestinian refugee camp, Ein El-Helweh, in the southern part of Lebanon, using more than 150 vehicles, tanks and armoured cars. They also demolished about 30 houses belonging to peaceful citizens in that camp. This was then followed by a series of events in which dozens of Palestinians were killed or wounded, and several were arrested.

18. To commit such heinous crimes is nothing new in the brief history of the tyrannical Zionist entity, but it does underscore, day after day, our conviction and the conviction of the international community that the Zionist entity is developing and thriving on crime, usurpation and oppression, which have become the main features reflecting the real nature of the philosophy underlying its conduct.

19. The crime committed in Ein El-Helweh camp is not an isolated one. It is neither the first nor the last of its type committed by Israel. It is only one more link in a whole chain of inhuman crimes which Israel has committed and continues to commit in its desperate attempts to strengthen its grasp over that territory, whether in southern Lebanon, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, or the Syrian Golan Heights. Thus, what occurred in the southern part of occupied Lebanon cannot be divorced from what has happened and what is happening even now in other occupied Palestinian territories on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

20. The massacre after their arrest by the Israeli authorities of the two commandos who participated in the Ashdod operation is no different, as a heinous and indicative act, from the massacre of innocent women and children who had demonstrated against the occupying authorities in the camp of Ein El-Helweh. These acts are but two different forms of the same sterile thinking that gives the person who pursues this policy the right to commit atrocities against an unarmed people that is simply clamouring for its legitimate rights.

21. It is no longer a secret to anyone that the Zionist doctrine, which was essentially based on a false slogan—"a land without people for a people without a land"—cannot survive unless it is being continuously fed by a series of similar lies and falsehoods, which are characteristic of all the acts committed by Israel.

22. We have not yet forgotten that Israel invaded Lebanon, thus violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State under the spurious and feeble pretext of putting an end to the bombing of Israeli settlements. All neutral sources recognized that the bombing had stopped at least a year before this invasion occurred. The Israeli occupation of parts of sovereign Lebanon has persisted, however, despite all the resolutions adopted by the Council, starting with resolution 509 (1982), in which the Council demanded that Israel withdraw forthwith and unconditionally, as well as resolution 517 (1982), in which the Council censured Israel for its failure to comply with resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982), 512 (1982), 513 (1982), 515 (1982) and 516 (1982). This amply demonstrates that the reasons adduced by Israel to justify its barbaric invasion of Lebanon, which change according to circumstances, have always been spurious, and that the long-term objectives in Lebanese territory are today more obvious than ever. They have been confirmed and borne out by the persistence of the Israeli occupation, with all that entails in tragedy and suffering for the Lebanese and Palestinian people.

23. This latest Israeli crime, which is the expression of a doctrine and method used by the Israeli authorities in all their practices and policies in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories should remind us of the following points.

24. First, the Israeli authorities, as is now becoming increasingly evident, are convinced that the Palestinian presence, in theory and in practice, constitutes a danger to Israeli territorial dreams because it serves as a constant reminder to the international community of the fate of the Palestinian people following the well-known international plots which resulted in the creation of a Jewish State on Palestinian territory. That is why the Israeli authorities have always had recourse to two principal means of dealing with this reality. The first is to defame the Palestinian people, portray them in the eyes of the world as nothing more than a group of terrorists and endeavour to nip in the bud the idea that this is a people struggling for its legitimate rights; then to proceed to the physical annihilation of that people by seizing their properties, expelling them from their country and terrorizing them by forcing them to emigrate, applying collective sanctions and using other methods common in the worst days of imperialism.

25. Secondly, the Israeli authorities have the mistaken illusion that the extermination of the Palestinian people and the terror through which they are trying to stifle the Palestinian movement in the Arab Palestinian territories can succeed in dissuading that people from carrying on their national struggle. If the Israelis looked at the history of colonialism in general and at the years they have themselves spent in applying their policy of colonialist occupation in the occupied territories, they would realize that the policy of terror and repression, however ingeniously it is put into practice, cannot succeed in shaking the will of a people struggling for its right to be free. Very often it has precisely the opposite result—that is, it tends to increase the will and the resolve of those people to continue their struggle.

26. Thirdly, the Israeli authorities harbour another illusion—that is, that by applying the policy of terror in the occupied territories, whether it be in southern Lebanon, the West Bank or the Gaza Strip, they can put an end to the commandos' operations against the occupying forces. It would not be unrealistic to say that such an erroneous conception corresponds to the ideas of the former Minister for Foreign Affairs, Abba Eban, who, according to *The Jerusalem Post*, said:

> "For a number of years now we have been dominated by poisoned imaginations, such as that which claims that 1,250,000 Palestinians, who are internationally recognized as a separate people, could be permanently subjugated by the Israeli authorities."

The heroic struggle of the Lebanese people against Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon and the heroic struggle of the Palestinian people against Israeli occupation on the West Bank and in Gaza should convince

the Israeli authorities that a policy of terror and repression cannot put a stop to the struggle against the occupation. Nothing will stop that struggle but the cessation of occupation; if Israel wants to ensure the security of its troops in the occupied territories it has only to withdraw them.

27. Fourthly, the Israeli authorities, in committing these crimes against the Palestinian and Lebanese people in the occupied territories, are committing a dual crime, since instead of protecting the civilians in the occupied areas, as the authority responsible for the protection of civilians, in accordance with the fourth Geneva Convention,[1] they commit acts of aggression against civilians and their property and seek to change the geographical, legal and demographic status of the regions they occupy, in contravention of the letter and spirit of the provisions of the Geneva Convention.

28. The Arab world, which has been profoundly shaken by persistent Israeli arrogance and the systematic pursuit of a policy of extermination and repression in occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and by the fact that the Council has not fully shouldered its responsibility to put a stop to the actions of Israel, appeals to the Council to fulfil its responsibilities as defined in the Charter of the United Nations.

29. Israel is fully responsible for what is occurring in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. As the occupation authority, it is called upon not only to put an end to the massacres, dispersal, torture and imprisonment of civilians in the occupied territories and the destruction of their houses, in violation of international law, but to protect those citizens and their goods until the fate of the occupied areas has been finally decided.

30. That is why the Council is required to shoulder its full responsibility and to ensure the implementation of all its resolutions on this matter. We refer to the following resolutions: first, the resolutions requesting Israel to put an end to its contravention of international legality in the occupied territories and to provide safeguards which would guarantee that these violations of international instruments and resolutions will not be repeated; secondly, the resolutions calling on Israel to withdraw from all Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967, since such a withdrawal is the only effective remedy for all the evils that constitute a permanent threat to peace and security in the Middle East; thirdly, the resolutions demanding that the Palestinian people be enabled to exercise their inalienable rights, including their right to self-determination and to establish their own State on the soil of their fatherland; fourthly, the resolutions concerning the guarantees of the independence, territorial integrity and security of Lebanon, and the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops, in accordance with resolution 509 (1982).

31. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: The next speaker is the representative of Lebanon, upon whom I now call.

32. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: Allow me at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of May and to express to you our confidence that your wisdom and experience will enable you successfully to guide the work of the Council. I should also like to extend our thanks to your predecessor, Mr. Vladimir Kravets, representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, for the politically competent and outstanding way in which he presided over the Council last month.

33. The events that occurred on the night of 15/16 May and on 17 May in the Ein El-Helweh camp south-east of Sidon in occupied southern Lebanon deserve the serious attention of the Council. The Israel Defence Forces launched a large-scale assault, with a big force, attacking the camp from every direction with three contingents and then overrunning it. Those forces blew up several houses, some of them while the occupants were still inside. They also arrested approximately 150 people, who were transported on three buses to a concentration camp, and killed or wounded many inhabitants of the camp.

34. Such an onslaught cannot be justified, and the responsibility for it cannot be evaded. We have stated here on numerous occasions that the Council will bear a heavy responsibility if its numerous resolutions on southern Lebanon and on Israel's withdrawal to internationally recognized borders remain without practical application and implementation. We do not advocate the accumulation of resolutions that remain dead letters, whether adopted by the Council or by other bodies. Hence our legitimate and rightful call for the implementation of earlier Council resolutions will continue to be made until it is heeded and until the Council responds effectively and sincerely to the demands of right and justice.

35. Since its occupation of southern Lebanon, Israel has consistently launched oppressive military campaigns and carried out inhuman practices against Lebanese citizens in their villages and Palestinians in their camps on Lebanese territory. It is our national duty to inform international public opinion about campaigns and practices and to call upon the Council to denounce them, deplore them and condemn them, because they are in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of human rights.

36. It is also incumbent upon the Council to put an end once and for all to the present state of affairs by prevailing upon Israel to comply with its resolutions by withdrawing completely from southern Lebanon so that the Lebanese State may regain its sovereignty and authority up to its internationally recognized border and transform the south into a zone of peace and security.

37. This latest act of aggression is very serious, whether it was planned and carried out by contingents

of the Israel Defence Forces or completed by groups established, armed and trained by Israel. No allegation, statement or attempt to distort the facts and camouflage realities can absolve the occupying Power of its direct responsibility.

38. Had we decided to lodge a complaint with the Council about every aggressive act or practice on the part of Israel we could have taken up all the Council's time from now until the end of the year. I have already on several occasions recalled some of the acts of aggression and arbitrary practices carried out by Israel in southern Lebanon, which include the following: first, there is Israel's blocking of all access routes to the south, which has led to the complete isolation of that region from the other parts of Lebanon; secondly, there is the destruction of walls surrounding orchards and the uprooting of fruit-bearing trees along the roads in a large area of the country; thirdly, ports in the south have been blockaded, thus intensifying the strangulation of the country begun by the blocking of the access roads; fourthly, fishermen have been prevented from practising their trade, thus depriving the poorer classes of their only means of livelihood; fifthly, in the larger cities there has been indiscriminate firing on civilians, including men, women and children; sixthly, the homes of peaceful citizens have been violated, although those homes should be inviolable, and terrorist attacks have been carried out against them by Israeli soldiers, who do not hesitate to use any kind of arbitrary method; seventhly, a mercenary army has been established to work in Israel's interests and has been entrusted by Israel with the carrying out of outrageous acts against peaceful citizens; eighthly, there has been indiscriminate aerial bombing of Lebanese cities and towns, the most recent instance of which was the bombing the other day in the Bekaa area.

39. If the Council does not take a position commensurate with the gravity of the Israeli practices, that failure will pave the way for Israel to persist in its attempt to change the geographic and demographic character of southern Lebanon in furtherance of its own interests and of its own designs, under the pretext—a false pretext—of the protection of its security. Israel invoked that pretext for the aggression of June 1982, and its army overran more than 100 kilometres of Lebanese territory, including the capital of the country, Beirut.

40. We call on all the members of the Council to recognize the real situation in occupied southern Lebanon and to heed the dictates of their conscience, as reflected in the Council's resolutions. We call on them to do their duty of preserving the safety of southern Lebanon, its citizens, its residents, and restoring to Lebanon, the motherland, the territory usurped by blood and sword.

41. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I now call on him.

42. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, I greet you, first, as the representative of a nation whose peoples paid an extremely high price in human as well as material sacrifice in their struggle against the Nazi hordes that invaded their country. I greet you, also, as the representative of a nation that fully and unconditionally supports the international consensus for the convening of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East, for the achievement of peace by means of a just solution to the Palestinian problem. That Conference would, under the international consensus, be held with the participation of the parties to the Israeli-Arab conflict. We have every confidence in you as a person, and we are sure that with your prudence, your capabilities and your experience you will successfully conduct the work of the Council this month.

43. We extend our thanks to the members of the Council who—notwithstanding the one negative vote—have made it possible for the PLO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, to convey to the international community, through the Council, the sincere aspiration and determination of our people to achieve peace in the Holy Land, in Palestine and in the region.

44. Mr. President, we offer your predecessor, the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, our appreciation for the wise way in which he conducted the Council's business last month. The commitment of the Ukrainian people, like that of all the peoples of the Soviet Socialist Republics, to the cause of justice and the cause of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, has been and is still being concretely manifested in the membership of the Ukrainian SSR in the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

45. Let us now reflect for a moment on what happened on 16 May 1943—41 years ago. In Warsaw that date marked the last day of the criminal proceedings and acts of genocide undertaken by S.S. Chief of Brigade and Major General of Police Juergen Stroop. The campaign to eliminate the heroes of the Warsaw Ghetto had been under way, the campaign to remove Jews from the Warsaw Ghetto "for security reasons"—the same reasons used by the Fascists in Tel Aviv—and to "resettle" them, mostly in Treblinka, where they were gassed, exterminated, physically eliminated. We know that those Jews resisted, with pistols and home-made Molotov cocktails. They resisted Nazi occupation; they resisted dehumanization; they fought for their survival, in dignity, in their homes.

46. It is worth noting here that some months earlier the leaders of the IZL [*Irgun Zvai Leumi*]—the so-called Israel Liberation Movement, members of which are still alive and hold key positions in the military junta currently commanding in Tel Aviv—were, having turned their backs on their own people, issuing communiqués calling for co-operation with the new order in

Europe, co-operation that would also be along the lines of one of the last speeches of the German Reich Chancellor, Adolf Hitler. Such communiqués encouraged some to co-operate in the formation of the *Judenrats*—Jewish Councils. I hasten to state that others joined the *Judenrats*, as they believed that the Nazis would then spare their lives, albeit at the cost of the lives of hundreds of thousands of other Jewish brothers and sisters in the Ghetto.

47. But the true nature of the Nazis was unveiled when even the collaborators were not spared. And we know that the true nature of the Zionist junta in Tel Aviv is also being unveiled now, if everyone is not already aware of it.

48. On 16 May 1984, the world was shocked by a similar racist, genocidal crime. The President of the Security Council was immediately informed, as was the Secretary-General. It is our understanding that the Secretary-General informed the Security Council on 18 May—more than 48 hours later—that the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) had informed him on that day that, at approximately 2300 hours on the night of 15/16 May, the so-called Israel Defence Forces (IDF)—more correctly, the Judeo-Nazi troops of occupation—had surrounded the Ein El-Helweh camp (meaning, I presume, the Palestinian refugee camp at Ein El-Helweh). Now, 2300 hours on the night of 15/16 May means 1600 hours New York time on 15 May. Our question is this: Why did not the Commissioner-General report the matter immediately? Be that as it may, the Council was also informed that the responsible officers of the IDF troops of occupation had refused to see the senior official of UNRWA. Naturally they would refuse: their troops were in the midst of committing heinous crimes.

49. We understand that the report of the Secretary-General to the Council indicates that members of the "Palestinian National Guard" were firing at boys burning tyres on 17 May. The significant element here is that those boys were burning tyres. The only explanation I can give in that respect is that this act was to obstruct and prevent the advance of Israeli occupation troops further inside the refugee camp. This is a heroic and legitimate act of self-defence, and we are proud that those boys took action. The other significant element is that the so-called Palestinian National Guard is reported to be organized by the IDF. "IDF" should mean "incommensurably degenerate Fascists". Those IDF troops by any other name are still IDF troops. The perpetrators of the crime could be Israeli troops or any of their instruments.

50. The human conscience does not consider the Nazi crimes, and especially the genocide in the Warsaw Ghetto, any less criminal simply because there were the thugs of the *Judenrats* or because some Jews responded positively to the appeal by the so-called Israeli liberation movement. The crime was still the crime of the Nazis, and likewise the crime here is still the crime of the junta in Tel Aviv. The world holds Adolf Hitler and his gang fully and solely responsible, and rightly so. Similarly, one can assume that the Council will consider the junta in Tel Aviv and the military field commanders solely and fully responsible for this latest in a long series of crimes, including the crime of genocide committed in Sabra and Shatila refugee camps in September 1982.

51. The responsibility of the occupying Power is well defined in the norms of international law, and Israel is still an occupying Power. I am not at all surprised at the way in which the United Nations correspondent of *The New York Times* reported his story on Sunday. He only missed the point, and maliciously so, that the so-called Palestinian National Guard is only another unit of the Israeli troops of occupation. Here again is another Fascist phenomenon. We are informed that the funeral procession for the woman shot by the "Palestinian National Guard" had been broken up by the "Palestinian National Guard" by shooting, which resulted in the wounding of five or six refugees, and by making arrests. We keep hearing about the "Palestinian National Guard", but not the so-called Palestinian National Guard as a unit of the Israeli occupation army. We trust that somehow this point will be clarified to the general public.

52. Reference has been made to the *Judenrats*, and something similar is taking place in the occupied Palestinian territory. On 24 April 1984, a new co-ordinator of the Government's activities in the territories, a certain Shmu'el Goren, took office, and at the first stage he will have to deal with the appointment of a head of the civilian administration in "Judaea and Samaria", that is, the occupied Palestinian territory, and the question of the structure of the civilian administration and military government. He will also have to find new mayors to replace the army officers now heading several municipalities in the territory. So the analogy here of the *Judenrats* and the appointment of new mayors by the Co-ordinator—by a military governor—is only another phenomenon. Why? Because the occupying Power in 1976 had tried elections for the local councils and for mayors, and the result stunned the occupying Power. There was unanimous rejection of the occupation and support for the PLO as the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people under occupation. After that experience, of course, Israel would not dare to indulge in elections in the occupied territories.

53. Judging from the past diatribes of the representative of the Tel Aviv junta, the Council will be told that the IDF went to the camp to search for arms and for those who use the arms and explosives against the Israeli troops of occupation. Frankly, one is proud to note that the population in southern Lebanon, be they Lebanese citizens or Palestinian refugees, are only exercising a legitimate and inalienable right to resist foreign occupation by all means available to them, including explosives—namely, armed struggle. Occupa-

tion engenders resistance, and this is exactly what the population under foreign occupation, not only in southern Lebanon but in all the territories under occupation, is doing and will continue to do as long as Israel remains in those territories. To resist foreign occupation is a right and a duty. We can share in honouring the memory of the millions who sacrificed their lives while resisting foreign occupation in Europe, in Africa, in Asia and in Latin America. The memory of those freedom fighters remains our beacon.

54. Israel is the occupying Power in southern Lebanon. On 6 June 1982, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 509 (1982), in which, *inter alia*, it demanded "that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon". I think no further clarification is needed to illustrate that Israel is the occupying Power; it has not complied with that resolution and, unfortunately, action by the Council is still being hampered and undermined by at least one permanent member of the Council. As long as Israel occupies southern Lebanon and Palestinian and other Arab territories, Israel should be held responsible for such criminal acts and the Council must condemn Israel for those acts.

55. What, one wonders, is to be done? The PLO maintains that it is the duty of the Security Council to insist that the provisions of the Charter and other international conventions be respected. The Charter expects each and every Member "to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council". Article 1 of the fourth Geneva Convention[1] reads: "The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect and to ensure respect for the present Convention in all circumstances." Thus, it is incumbent upon the members of the Council, both collectively and individually, to ensure respect for those provisions and for those moral values. The Council is called upon to invoke the powers vested in it and thus help contribute to the maintenance of the faith and trust of peoples in the Council. The Council is called upon to impose mandatory sanctions on a Member that violates the Charter, commits crimes and fails to respect the conventions—in this case the fourth Geneva Convention.

56. It has been rumoured that the Council should establish a special commission to investigate. The question is: to investigate what? The Council has unanimously considered Israel to be an occupying Power, and the Council must of necessity recognize the inevitability of resistance against the troops of occupation and so-called countermeasures of repression, savagery and even genocide taken by the occupying Power. So the investigation will be a waste of time. It might be a drug. There should be an immediate call and action to ensure that Israel is totally out of Lebanon and the other territories it has occupied, where the Council has unanimously requested and demanded that withdrawal.

57. We have had some experience in this regard: it may be recalled that the Council had established, under resolution 446 (1979), a special Commission to examine the situation relating to settlements in the occupied Arab territories. The Commission was refused cooperation by Israel, and in its first report [*S/13450 and Add.1 of 12 July 1979*] it referred to the Israeli actions. That report was unanimously adopted by the Council in resolution 465 (1980), and when the Commission presented its second report [*S/14268*], dated 25 November 1980, the Council refrained from considering the report, and there it lies in the archives of the Secretariat. Why? Our understanding is that one permanent member had impeded consideration and threatened to reject the report. That member is the United States. It not only impeded the work of the Council, but it granted Israel, the occupying Power, more moral and financial support and entered into a military-strategic alliance with it.

58. The daily bulletin of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency of 18 May tells us that the Executive Director of the so-called American-Israel Public Affairs Committee claimed that Israel was the engine that passed the foreign aid bill in the House of Representatives. They are referring to the House of Representatives in Washington, not in Tel Aviv. Be that as it may, the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee considers that it was thanks to Israel that the bill was passed. What does that bill include? It includes a total grant to Israel for the year 1985 of $2.5 billion: $1.1 billion in economic aid and $1.4 billion in military aid to that arsenal in the Middle East that is threatening peace in the region and in the world. So we can see to what extent there is collusion and collaboration by the Government of the United States in Israel's criminal acts.

59. We have been informed by the representative of Lebanon that a number of people were arrested and taken away. Here we have to express grave fear, based on past experience. Indeed, in a report dated 18 April 1984, Amnesty International expressed its concern that detainees held in Israel were being denied their legal rights in accordance with internationally accepted standards, including the principles of international humanitarian law. Amnesty International is further concerned that almost all have been held incommunicado since mid-November 1983 and that they have been denied access to humanitarian organizations, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), or to lawyers or to their families. One of the prisons in which detainees have been held incommunicado is in Atlit, where they are denied any access to, or means of communication with, their families or with international humanitarian organizations. That is the concern of Amnesty International.

60. To us there is more than concern. We fear for their lives as well. The Israelis claim that they do provide "human" consideration to those detainees. If they do there is a challenge by ICRC and Amnesty International and the entire international community: provide them with access.

61. As the Council knows, those people in Atlit were originally detained in the Ansar detention camp.

According to Amnesty International, they were supposed to have been released last year, but then Israel rearrested 136 Palestinians and Lebanese and put them back in Atlit prison. As a matter of fact, Israeli radio yesterday admitted that one of the detainees in the Ansar detention camp was killed. And why? Because, they say, he was trying to escape. They did not say that he was alone. They said that five detainees managed to escape; four were recaptured and the fifth was shot and killed.

62. The Council is considering the criminal act committed against the Ein El-Helweh refugee camp. We shall refrain from referring to the escalating repressive measures by the Israelis against our people in occupied Palestinian territory, in Nablus, in Jerusalem, in Bethlehem, in Hebron: all those criminal acts are being reported to the Council and to the Secretary-General as they occur, which is very often.

63. Let me recall that the General Assembly, on 15 December 1983, in its resolution 38/79 D, has requested the Security Council

> "to ensure Israel's respect for and compliance with all the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, in Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and to initiate measures to halt Israeli policies and practices in those territories".

I wonder whether the Council has been made aware of that request of the General Assembly and, if it has, whether it has taken any action to respond—somehow at least—to the request that was adopted by an overwhelming majority.

64. Finally, we trust that the Council will take the proper action, which was outlined by the representative of Lebanon, in order to ensure that Israel complies with the resolutions of the Council and, at the same time, that the Council will see to it that some measures are taken to guarantee the safety and security of civilians in the territories occupied by Israel, be it in southern Lebanon or in any part of Palestinian or other Arab territory.

65. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: The next speaker is the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Massamba Sarré. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

66. Mr. SARRÉ (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) [*interpretation from French*]: Let me first, Sir, congratulate you very sincerely and extend to you my best wishes for success as President of the Council for the month of May. During the past three weeks we have all been able to assess your talent and skill in carrying out your very delicate task.

67. Your predecessor, Mr. Vladimir Kravets of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, also deserves our commendation for the authority and skill with which he conducted the Council's work during the month of April.

68. Finally, I should like to thank all the members of the Council for allowing me, as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and as representative of Senegal, to participate in this debate, which we regard as very important. Senegal's head of State, Mr. Abdou Diouf, only recently expressed, at a meeting of the National Council of the Socialist Party of Senegal, his concern over the worsening of the situation in the Middle East.

69. For all the members of the Committee the question before the Council is particularly disturbing because it closely concerns not only the future of the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon but also international peace and security.

70. As members well know, in the past few years the Security Council has met frequently to consider the situation in the Middle East and related events in Lebanon and to take action on them. The very fact that the Security Council and the General Assembly have had to meet so often to consider these questions confirms the international community's deep concern about these practices and their serious consequences.

71. Today, as we examine the recent events in the Palestinian refugee camp of Ein El-Helweh in southern Lebanon, the massacres of Sabra and Shatila come to mind, because of the similarities between the two cases.

72. The Council will agree with the members of the Committee that the operation carried out during the night of 15/16 May in the refugee camp of Ein El-Helweh shocks the human conscience and represents a systematic denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people as expressed in a number of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. Moreover, that operation was a flagrant violation of human rights as defined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

73. The Committee notes that, taking advantage of the tragedy in Lebanon, Israel is trying to silence the Palestinians who are legitimately protesting against the occupation of their territory, and is pursuing its illegal plans to annex the West Bank and Gaza, in defiance of international law and world public opinion, as evidenced in the many letters that the Committee has sent to the Secretary-General and to the Council. It is also interesting to note that this policy of annexation is condemned by a certain section of Israeli public opinion, which, it should be stressed, has the merit of understanding that Israel's security lies in dialogue with the parties concerned rather than in the pure and simple annexation of territory.

74. All these practices and policies exacerbate the tensions in the region and endanger international peace and security. Scarcely a day passes without news of repressive measures and harassment against the civilian populations of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and against the refugees in Lebanon. Demonstrations are put down by force, invariably ending in loss of human life. Schools and other educational establishments are closed for weeks, even months, sometimes for the most frivolous reasons. Freedom of education and equality before the law are flouted.

75. These events show that it is now more than ever necessary for the Security Council to consider, in the light of General Assembly resolution 38/58, the question of Palestine in its entirety—in particular, the guidelines for an International Peace Conference on the Middle East. Such a conference could have beneficial effects on the whole region, and particularly on Lebanon, whose unity and territorial integrity must be safeguarded, today more than ever before. The constant outbreaks of violence which we witness often spring from the failure to settle the question of the Middle East and the Palestinian cause. Today violence seems to have been elevated to the level of law, continually claiming innocent victims. In the light of all this, the Council must without further delay seek to promote a climate of mutual confidence which will allow all the interested parties to calm their passions in order to devote themselves to the peace process, as defined by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine and approved by the General Assembly in the resolution that I have just mentioned.

76. If the Council did not intervene in the present circumstances it would be a confession of impotence on the part of the Organization, as the Secretary-General —to whom we pay a tribute for all his efforts in the cause of Palestine and the Middle East—stressed in his very telling report to the General Assembly shortly after he took office.

77. Faced with the constant worsening of the situation in the region, the Council has the duty and responsibility to take the appropriate measures to put an end to these tragic events and bring about the renewal of the policy of dialogue between all the parties concerned in order to bring about the return of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, a peace which will take fully into account the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine.

78. Mr. VERMA (India): We have already had the opportunity to felicitate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of May. Your ready response, and indeed that of the members of the Council, to the request to convene the Council to consider the latest incident in the occupied areas of southern Lebanon is indeed a testimony to the Council's sensitivity to the gravity of the challenge faced by the hapless Palestinians under Israeli occupation. It is our sincere expectation that the deliberations in the Council under your able presidency will lead to respect for the rule of law and human rights in the occupied Arab lands.

79. Representatives who have spoken before me have placed before the Council a detailed *exposé* of the recent tragic events in the Ein El-Helweh camp in southern Lebanon. The actions carried out there provide clear evidence of the increasing acts of brutality and repression being perpetrated in the occupied Arab territories by the Israeli authorities. The recent statement by the Secretary-General, based on the report received from the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, has also provided information on the current tense situation prevailing in the camp. We were shocked to learn about the indiscriminate and inhuman acts against unarmed Palestinian civilians living in the Ein El-Helweh camp, which resulted in a number of civilian casualties. This is not an isolated event; similar serious armed attacks have been reported earlier in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories. Raids and indiscriminate killing, torture, imprisonment and harassment of Palestinians have become daily occurrences. The present incidents come in the wake of numerous other tragic incidents following the genocidal massacres of Sabra and Shatila. Israel has been relentlessly pursuing its policy of intimidation of the civilian population and consolidation of its stranglehold on the occupied Arab territories.

80. The need of the hour is to put an immediate end to the bloodshed and the continuing harassment of the Palestinians and to restore peace and order in the occupied territories. Israel should be made to discharge its obligations under the relevant international conventions that dictate civilized behaviour on the part of occupying Powers towards the people of occupied territories. Israel must withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon, in implementation of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). Israel's policies and practices of establishing settlements in the occupied territories are illegal and are contrary to the resolutions of the United Nations. At the same time, it is imperative that the international community seek a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the conflict in the Middle East, without which no peace can prevail in the region.

81. The fundamental principles of and the basic framework for such a solution already exist in the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the Arab peace plan adopted at Fez [*see S/15510 of 6 December 1982, annex*], the pronouncements of the non-aligned countries at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government [*see S/15675, annex*], held at New Delhi in March 1983, and the Geneva Declaration on Palestine,[2] adopted in September 1983 at the international Conference on the Question of Palestine.

82. These well-recognized fundamental principles are: first, that the question of Palestine is at the heart of

the problem of the Middle East, and no solution to that problem can be envisaged without taking into account the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people; secondly, that the implementation of these inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to return to their homes and property and to exercise their right to self-determination, including the establishment of a State of their own, will contribute to a final solution of the Middle East crisis; thirdly, that the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people, on an equal footing is indispensable to all efforts at finding a solution to the Middle East problem; and, lastly, that no just and lasting peace in the Middle East can be established without the withdrawal of Israel from the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and without the guarantee that all States in the region can live within secure and recognized boundaries.

83. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries attaches paramount importance to the achievement of a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East. It has been at the initiative of the non-aligned countries that the majority of United Nations resolutions on the subject have been adopted. In past years the non-aligned countries have been particularly active in mobilizing international support against Israeli actions in occupied territories and against Israel's invasion of Lebanon. It was on their initiative that the seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly was resumed to consider the rapid and grave deterioration of conditions in the area. The ninth emergency special session on the question of the occupied Arab territories was also convened to declare the Israeli annexation of the Golan Heights null and void [*resolution ES-9/1*]. At the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East were extensively examined. Fundamental principles for the solution of those problems were again reaffirmed. The summit Conference also decided to establish a committee at the level of heads of State or Government to co-operate with the seven-member Arab Committee in supporting the rights of the Arab Palestinian people, in accordance with international law and with the will of the non-aligned countries and their peoples.

84. The Security Council should take effective and urgent action to prevent further bloodshed and misery in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories. The recent incidents in the Ein El-Helweh camp in southern Lebanon are regrettable, and responsibility for those atrocities lies squarely with the occupying Israeli forces. The policies and practices of Israel in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, in particular the establishment of settlements, are illegal and inadmissible.

85. Above all, the Council should strive to find a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the situation in the Middle East, as a matter of priority. In this context, we have supported the call for an International Peace Conference on the Middle East.

86. Our efforts so far to find a comprehensive solution to the problem have not succeeded, mainly owing to the arrogance and intransigence of Israel, which has deliberately defied the will of the international community. The time has come to put an end to the situation and to strive for a just, durable and comprehensive peace which would enable the Palestinian people to exercise their right in freedom and sovereignty in their independent homeland.

87. India, as the current Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and as a country which has stood by the Palestinians in their legitimate struggle for nationhood, stands ready to co-operate with the other members of the Council in endeavours in that direction.

88. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: The events which took place from 15 to 18 May in the Palestinian Ein El-Helweh camp in southern Lebanon demand more than an attempt to determine the tally of victims or a description of the reasons why those events occurred. That act of aggression, in fact, cannot be viewed in isolation from what is taking place in their occupied territories; it is an integral part of a well-thought-out, carefully formulated, comprehensive plan for the years to come.

89. It is regrettable that we are meeting today not to consider the means of making it possible for the Palestinian people fully to exercise their inalienable rights, and that the Council will once again have to be content with considering the consequences of events without being able to remedy the root cause: that is, the persistence of Israel's occupation of southern Lebanon and other Arab territories and its relentless attempt to eliminate the Palestinian presence in the region and prevent the Palestinian people from exercising their rights.

90. What happened in the Ein El-Helweh camp is only one of many acts committed against the Palestinians. This camp was surrounded by some 1,500 Israeli soldiers, armed to the teeth and supported by tanks. Then those forces stormed the camp, and it is easy to imagine what occurred thereafter. The information which we have so far proves without any doubt that the unarmed population of that camp was surprised during the night. The soldiers who took part in the aggression arrested some Palestinians. It appears that so far the Israelis have not disclosed how many. That attack was accompanied by explosions and the destruction of a certain number of houses, which resulted in many injuries and several killed, with the increased tension resulting from such acts of terror.

91. Furthermore, the occupation authorities surprised us by creating and training what they call the Palestinian National Guard. This so-called National

Guard has frequently fired on the unarmed population, including children, women and old people. It has also fired on the mourners in the funeral procession of a female victim. The mobilization of such agents against the Palestinians is a very dangerous development which is clearly aimed at sowing discord and dissent in the ranks of the Palestinians. We denounce unequivocally this act on the part of the occupying authorities.

92. Egypt has frequently demanded that Israel respect the fourth Geneva Convention.[1] We again call on the Israeli occupation authorities to fulfil their obligations under that Convention. Similarly, we reaffirm the need for the United Nations to be allowed to participate more effectively in the protection of the unarmed people in these camps. We therefore ask the Council to shoulder its responsibilities and ensure that this civilian population does not remain the victim of the terrorism of the occupying forces, whose acts we firmly condemn. The most recent events in Ein El-Helweh prove the correctness of our claims and the urgent need to take action.

93. We started our statement by saying that the root cause of the repetition of these unjust acts was the Israeli occupation, the persistence of which threatens to widen the circle of violence and to touch off, under whatever pretext, a new cycle of aggression against the Palestinians and their camps, to be followed by a complaint to the Security Council, the logical resort for victims of aggression.

94. That will be to no avail, however, as long as the Council's resolutions demanding Israel's withdrawal accumulate but remain a dead letter. The evil thus persists, because we are simply dealing with the symptoms without getting to the root of the conflict. We must eliminate the imposed consequences of the Israeli occupation, accompanied by the harassment and murder of Palestinian refugees, as well as by the policies of collective punishment, which should be vigorously immediate measures to protect the civilians, including the Palestinian refugees, and to guarantee their safety and security. This is the least that can be done to remedy this situation, which derives essentially from the continued illegal presence of Israel in southern Lebanon. The United Nations must act decisively to ensure compliance with its decisions guaranteeing complete Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon to the internationally recognized borders.

95. Mr. Shah NAWAZ (Pakistan): Last month, on the eve of the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) the Secretary-General presented a report throwing light on the situation in southern Lebanon and the problems created by the presence of the Israeli occupation forces there. The Secretary-General observed that:

> "There was a noticeable increase of hostile reactions by the local population against the presence of IDF. A growing resistance against the activities of IDF ... was observed by UNIFIL. Strikes and other demonstrations, usually accompanied by various forms of protest, such as the burning of tyres and the erection of road barricades, were held on several occasions in reaction to arrests of local inhabitants." [*S/16472, para. 15*]

96. During the period of the report, UNIFIL recorded some 22 incidents involving exploded or unexploded bombs along the roads patrolled by the Israel Defence Forces. The Secretary-General also observed that the Israel Defence Forces plan to establish "village committees" under Israeli guidance met with little success. The Secretary-General went on to say that for stated reasons of security the Israeli forces engaged in the practice of erecting road-blocks, cordoning off villages, searching houses and detaining local inhabitants.

97. The Israeli intrusion into the Ein El-Helweh Palestinian refugee camp outside Sidon last week was part of such operations. It is the latest of a series of provocative acts undertaken by the Israeli forces since their occupation of southern Lebanon to harass the local population.

98. The speakers who have preceded me, in particular the representative of Lebanon and the observer for the PLO, have already given details of the deplorable action taken by the Israeli forces against the Ein El-Helweh Palestinian refugee camp, which resulted in the loss of innocent Palestinian lives and injuries to several Palestinian refugees. The Israeli troops have also wantonly destroyed several refugee shelters, using demolition charges, and have arrested an unspecified number of Palestinian refugees.

99. The Israeli resort to reprisals clearly points to the difficulties which Israel is facing in continuing its occupation of southern Lebanon. With their overwhelming superiority in weapons, the Israeli forces were able to overrun southern Lebanon two years ago, but obviously they have not been able to crush the spirit of the inhabitants of the area, who are valiantly resisting the occupation of their land. The sinister Israeli scheme to divide the population and recruit a mercenary militia loyal to Israel has also proved futile, as has been pointed out in the Secretary-General's report.

100. Israel is finding it increasingly costly to maintain its occupation of southern Lebanon. It is a measure of Israel's desperation that its forces have now resorted to reprisals, in clear contravention of international law, specifically the fourth Geneva Convention[1] and Security Council resolution 513 (1982), which calls for respect for the rights of the civilian populations without any discrimination and repudiated all acts of violence against those populations. In choosing the Palestinian refugee camps as the target of their retaliatory measures, the Israeli forces have merely demonstrated once again their unmitigated animosity and ruthlessness towards the Palestinian people.

101. In their scope, the Israeli actions in southern Lebanon are not limited to simple retaliatory measures; these are steps towards consolidation of Israel's control and assertion of its dominance in the region. There is every evidence to show that, far from abandoning its adventurist action in Lebanon, Israel is pursuing relentlessly its expansionist ambitions in the region. Israeli policies in occupied southern Lebanon appear to follow the pattern set earlier in the occupied West Bank, Gaza and the Golan Heights. As in the case of the other occupied territories, the situation in southern Lebanon will continue to cause tension and turbulence as long as the illegal Israeli presence persists there.

102. The Council has a solemn responsibility under its resolution 509 (1982) to secure the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon. This remains an immediate task and indeed is a first step towards a resolution of the Middle East question, at the heart of which lies the denial of the national rights of the Palestinian people. In this regard, a practical plan was suggested by the Secretary-General in his report on UNIFIL. It is a matter of profound regret that despite the unambiguous Council decisions calling for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon, the Secretary-General's plan remains unheeded.

103. The incident of the Ein El-Helweh camp is but the latest manifestation of the explosive situation which prevails in the occupied West Bank, Gaza, the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon. It is not enough for the international community to remain content with only an expression of its concern over the continued aggravation of the situation in these areas, the root of which lies in the Israeli occupation. It is incumbent on the international community to bring irresistible pressure on Israel to respect the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, the implementation of which is an indispensable requirement for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region.

104. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Israel in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) took a place at the Council table.

105. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I call on the representative of Israel.

106. Mr. BLUM (Israel): At the outset, Sir, permit me to pay my respects to you and to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency for the month of May.

107. There they go again. I am referring, of course, to those countries on whose behalf the representative of Kuwait has asked for this meeting. Those States apparently feared that their hypocrisy glands would atrophy. Consequently, it appears, they decided to activate those glands in order to revitalize them. The result is the farce being played out here today, and members of the Council know that it is a farce. What other construction can one place on this grotesque spectacle that is being performed here today—and members of the Council know that it is a grotesque spectacle, because some of them have said so in private conversations, which, of course, will prevent nobody from following here the scenario that has been decided upon and from engaging in the customary posturing.

108. We are ostensibly here today to discuss the situation in the Middle East, based on the letter from the representative of Kuwait, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States for the month of May, to consider the recent events in the camp of Ein El-Helweh. Of course, we have heard relatively little about the events in Ein El-Helweh. We have heard about many other things that do not seem to be related to the events of Ein El-Helweh. But, since the Council has decided to accede to the request of the representative of Kuwait, I think it is only proper that this farce be placed in its proper perspective. So let us for a few brief minutes address ourselves to the situation in the Middle East at this time.

109. I believe the Persian Gulf is an integral part of the Middle East. There has been an ominous escalation of tension in the Persian Gulf during the last few days. Members of the Council are familiar with this. The threat that this poses, not only to the peace and security of the world but also to the economy of the world, needs no elaboration. But, judging from what is happening here today, I would imagine that the situation in the Persian Gulf is marginal compared to the events of Ein El-Helweh. How else can one explain the fact that the Council, in its wisdom, is meeting on Ein El-Helweh but so far has not deemed it necessary to convene on the situation in the Persian Gulf to which I have just referred? But that, of course, is not surprising. After all, the situation in the Persian Gulf is closely related to the Iran-Iraq war, a war that has been going on now for almost four years.

110. According to a report in *The New York Times* of 17 May 1984, that war has claimed some 600,000 casualties on both sides: some 300,000 Iranian casualties—dead, wounded or captured—and a comparable number of Iraqi casualties in similar categories. That war has also created a very serious refugee situation—of more than 2.5 million refugees on both sides—thus exceeding even UNRWA's inflated numbers for the Palestinian Arab refugees.

111. The Council has displayed precious little interest in that war. Truth to tell, the Council has met on the average of once a year, for rather brief and anaemic

meetings, to discuss the Iran-Iraq war; that is as far as its preoccupation with that war goes. Thus, for instance, on 31 October 1983, some seven months ago, in its resolution 540 (1983), the Council, among other things, requested the Secretary-General to consult with the parties regarding immediate and effective implementation of this resolution. And there we stand.

112. I must conclude that the Iran-Iraq war, in a region that is an integral part of the Middle East, is also a marginal phenomenon, obviously subordinate to the extraordinary events of Ein El-Helweh last week.

113. To be sure, the Council more recently did address itself to one other aspect of the Iran-Iraq war—to the use of chemical weapons by some anonymous user, because we here in the Council are of course not aware of the identity of the user of those chemical weapons. So the Council on 30 March of this year met for all of 10 minutes to discuss that situation and even approved a presidential statement that was made on that occasion which decided, among other things, "to keep the situation between Iran and Iraq under close review" [*2524th meeting, para. 3*]. How close, we have all witnessed ever since. The fact that we were confronted here with a very serious breach of the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare,[3] it appears, warranted the attention of the Council for 10 minutes only. I must conclude that the use of gas by the anonymous user in the Iran-Iraq war is obviously an event that is marginal compared with the events at Ein El-Helweh of last week.

114. Then there is another minor event in our region, in the Middle East. It has been going on for more than four years. I am referring to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The harassment and terrorizing of the population of that country by the Soviet invading forces has been ominously stepped up in recent weeks. The inhuman Soviet actions in Afghanistan have broken new records with the Panshir offensive launched last 24 April. This is the third assault on the Panshir Valley since 1982. It involves 20,000 Soviet troops supported by some 500 tanks, helicopter gunships and about 100 Soviet fighter bombers. Similar operations are under way in the Kandahar, Nangahar and Harat regions of Afghanistan. This offensive by the Soviet forces of occupation against the people of Afghanistan is characterized by unprecedented high-altitude saturation bombing carried out by planes based in the Soviet Union and in Afghanistan, and there are strong indications that the Soviet forces of occupation have also been resorting to chemical warfare against the people of Afghanistan.

115. Moreover, a very serious refugee situation has been created there. About one third of the population of Afghanistan has reportedly left that country. Three million people have fled to Pakistan—mainly to the Peshawar region—and close to 2 million have fled to Iran. There has been reference in various international press reports to the "migratory genocide" practised by the Soviet forces of occupation as the means by which they seek to rid the country of opposition and of its population. But I am led to the conclusion that the situation in Afghanistan is of course marginal when compared to the events of Ein El-Helweh of last week.

116. I do not even want to mention the periodic episodes that occur in Syria as a result of which tens of thousands of citizens of that country have been murdered and massacred by their own Government. What does surprise me, of course, is that episodes such as that of February 1982, at Hama, where more than 20,000 Syrians were murdered by their own Government, do not deserve the attention of the representative of Kuwait and of the group for which he speaks. It does seem rather odd that Arab blood spilled on such occasions is apparently not worthy of consideration by the Council. I know the answer, of course: we have heard it many times before. It is a family affair, and there we are not supposed to intervene. We have heard this on many occasions in the past. I think it is a good answer, because otherwise I would have to suspect that the representative of Kuwait and the group for which he speaks discriminate against Arabs.

117. What is the situation in Lebanon proper, where there have also been some marginal events that have not been brought to the attention of the Council by the representative of Kuwait and by the group for which he speaks? One marginal event occurred in Beirut on 17 March last when, according to reports from that city, 13 people were killed and 35 wounded. Another marginal event occurred on 14 April when 13 children and 10 adults were killed and at least 50 people were wounded in a day of indiscriminate shelling of west Beirut. Another marginal event occurred in Beirut on 12 May, last week, when savage shelling in the city claimed 16 lives and ignited huge fires throughout the capital only hours after hundreds of children had staged the country's first peace march.

118. Now, there have been hundreds, if not thousands, of casualties—fatalities and injuries—in Lebanon, primarily but not exclusively in Beirut, in recent months. The Council has not been galvanized into action by the representative of Kuwait and by the group for which he speaks, obviously because those events were marginal. The central events of the Middle East that affect the situation in the region are the events of Ein El-Helweh of last week. Do I have to elaborate on the meaning of all this?

119. The Arab Group wishes to feign unity where no such unity exists, and it uses such pretexts as the one which brought us here today to present a semblance of unity. Such unity does not exist on the conduct of Libya in the Sudan or in Chad, it does not exist on the Iran-Iraq war and it does not exist elsewhere, so to cover up their own internal dissensions, with which we are all familiar, we all have to go through this masquerade.

120. What are the facts of Ein El-Helweh? With the Council's permission I shall for a few minutes return to reality. For the past hour or so we have all visited fantasy land. It is time to return to reality.

121. The Israel Defence Forces have had reliable information about the existence of large quantities of arms and ammunition in Ein El-Helweh, and, acting on that information, on the night of 15/16 May, they conducted extensive search activities in Ein El-Helweh. In the course of that operation one house was entered in which arms and ammunition were found. In the process, the searchers encountered some resistance, as a result of which one resident of the house was injured and was transferred to a local hospital and another resident who tried to escape from the house was also injured.

122. After that, explosives and weapons were found in the courtyard of a house located in the centre of Ein El-Helweh. It was feared that those explosives were booby-trapped and linked to some timing devices and that their removal might risk explosions. For that reason, it was decided that the only safe course was to supervise their immediate detonation. That detonation caused some damage to a small number of adjacent houses. The Israel Defence Forces spokesman has already confirmed that Israel will assist the owners of houses damaged by the blast to make the necessary repairs.

123. In the course of the search the following weapons and ammunition were uncovered in Ein El-Helweh: 25 kilograms of explosives; 40 hand-grenades; electronic detonators; anti-vehicle mines; RPG's; anti-tank grenade launchers and grenades; flares; Soviet-made Kalashnikov rifles; sub-machine guns and rifles, as well as large quantities of magazines and ammunition.

124. On 16 and 17 May—that is, the first and second day after the arrests—demonstrations and disturbances were staged by local residents in the camp. Those events on 16 and 17 May involved only the local residents. They were characterized by attempts to settle accounts between themselves, as is quite customary in the underworld in general, throughout the world, and is also characteristic of the practices of the various PLO factions among themselves. We should all remember that those disturbances and demonstrations are a direct outcome of the ongoing conflict between the rival factions of the PLO terrorists, which are all represented in Ein El-Helweh. Ein El-Helweh houses a great number of those released from the Ansar Camp, hundreds of them. It includes operatives of virtually all factions of the PLO—supporters of Abou Moussa as well as other factions which are engaged in settling scores with one another, often by violent means, just as they do elsewhere. In addition to this cause for disturbances and exchanges of fire in the camp, there is the fact that dozens of the camp's residents who were formerly on the payroll of the PLO now find themselves without this source of steady income owing to the regrettably "reduced circumstances" of their paymaster. And since they are unemployed, of course the temptation to engage in the settling of scores with rival factions of the PLO only increases.

125. Let me again emphasize that all those events of 16 and 17 May involved only the local residents of the camp. It was then that the two fatalities occurred in Ein El-Helweh—two fatalities, not the 60 to which reference was made in the letter circulated last week by the Acting Chairman of the PLO Committee. I stress this point because I think it is just as well to draw attention to the credibility of the signatory of that letter. We are familiar with his customary truthfulness; he has adhered to it in this letter too. The provocative statement which was made here today by the Chairman of the PLO Committee falls in the same category of credibility.

126. Those are the facts, as distinct from fantasy, from the "central event" in the Middle East which we have been convened to discuss here today. And let me say this in all candour: It is the willingness of the Security Council to be dragged into debates of this kind by an irresponsible group of States that has done so much over the years to diminish the prestige and standing not only of the Council but of the United Nations as a whole.

127. We have been told that the Council has met very often in recent years on matters concerning Israel. That is of course true. But we have not been told the reason for those meetings: it is the kind of irresponsibility demonstrated here today by the group of States on whose behalf the representative of Kuwait spoke, as well as the well-known attempts of many other Members of the United Nations to divert attention from inconvenient trouble spots around the world—some of which I have mentioned here today and others of which I have not. That, of course, is the reason for this constant preoccupation by the Council with matters affecting my country—not the centrality of those matters.

128. The problems involving the situation in the Middle East lie elsewhere. I have tried in my statement here today to pinpoint some of them. The debate for which we have been convened here today is a caricature of what the Council should really address itself to when it comes to the situation in the Middle East. Those of us who are truly committed to the Charter and its principles, as distinct from those who abuse the Charter and the Organization, can only voice regret over these developments.

129. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 21 May from the representative of Kuwait [*S/16575*] which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request the Security Council to invite Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer

for the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to participate in the consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in the Middle East', in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure."

If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Council agrees to grant that request.

It was so decided.

130. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I invite Mr. Maksoud to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

131. Mr. MAKSOUD: I express to you, Mr. President, and through you to the other members of the Council the appreciation of the League of Arab States for the kind invitation extended to me to make a statement on the item on the agenda.

132. The statements made by the Chairman of the Group of Arab States, the representative of Lebanon and the Observer for the PLO have helped to bring out the basic facts of the situation unravelling in Ein El-Helweh and throughout the Middle East. We subscribe to the detailed analysis put before the Council and the information provided to it.

133. The League of Arab States is deeply concerned about the repetition of these incidents—in Ein El-Helweh, in the Bekaa, in the West Bank, in Gaza, in the Golan Heights—because it confronts us with two options. The first is this: every time there is an act of aggression by the Israeli occupation forces, every time these incidents are repeated, we come to the Security Council; this entails a degree of redundancy and the allegation that the debates of the Council are devalued because of the constant repetition. The second option is this: we do not have recourse to either the Council or the other machinery of the United Nations to redress the legitimate grievances of the Lebanese, the Palestinians and the Arabs in general concerning the constant attacks and other measures by Israel against the occupied territories.

134. If we come to the Council, we are told by the Israeli representatives that we are abusing the Council; if we have recourse to non-diplomatic, non-political, non-peaceful methods, then we are called terrorists. In any case, the situation is a no-win situation. If the Council is seized of this basic issue in the Middle East, Israel complains that somehow the Council and the United Nations are "ganging up" on Israel. If it cannot get away with its arrogance, it resorts to a mendicant approach. In both instances, it seeks to set itself up as prosecutor and judge at the same time. Hence the resort by the Israelis in the United Nations, and particularly in the Security Council, to filibuster, to deflect the Council from focusing on the issue before it. This is a technique, a tactic, a strategy, to cover up its creeping annexation of the West Bank—as the Benvenisti report has clearly stated—its attempts at creeping annexation in the south of Lebanon, its attempts to create so-called quislings within the occupied territories, in order to frustrate efforts by the authentic representatives of the people, in Lebanon or in the Palestinian movement, to articulate their aspirations and to communicate their grievances, as well as their rights, to the Council.

135. It may be said that the Middle East problem is not Ein El-Helweh. Of course, the events in Ein El-Helweh are a symptom. We ask: What is Israel doing in Ein El-Helweh? What is Israel doing in southern Lebanon? Are there not resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which are supposed to be operative? Yet the Israeli occupation continues in southern Lebanon. The Israeli representative has the audacity to state that what is taking place in Ein El-Helweh, in terms of the aggression by the Israelis, in terms of their coercive measures, in terms of their searches of homes, is a matter of right as far as the Israel Defence Force is concerned. That this is done in the name—the misnomer—of defence forces is really beyond our comprehension.

136. How can Israel arrogate to itself the right to determine what constitutes a crisis in the Middle East, when it is the cause and the source of this crisis? On what basis has the Israeli representative sought to render in biological terms our resort to the United Nations by saying that we cover up our hypocrisy when we find that our diplomatic glands are atrophying? First of all, the use of biological terms as part of the diplomatic vocabulary has occurred only once in this twentieth century: such terms were used only by the Nazi racists, who used them in order to steal a point. Those who consider themselves to be the victims of nazism should not repeat the semantics of nazism by resorting to insult, not only to the Arab States and the Arab Group but to the members of the Council, in an attempt to preempt their judgement, distort their views and deflect their debates, by saying they consider that the events in Ein El-Helweh are not so important.

137. Whatever the yardstick by which we measure events in the Middle East, whether in the Gulf region or in any other region, there remains one central issue: that Israel's usurpation of Palestinian rights, its annexation of Jerusalem, its annexation of the Golan Heights, its establishment and proliferation of illegal settlements, its continued occupation of southern Lebanon, its attempts to create quislings in the occupied territories, these continue to be a major source of tension and potential conflict in the region. That has been determined by the Security Council, by the General Assembly and by the international community. If the Israeli delegation wants to challenge this international consensus, in the same way as it defies the international conscience, that is inherent in its ideological make-up and in the pattern of its continuing behaviour.

138. At this moment we are discussing what actually happened in Ein El-Helweh. Of course, this is not as extensive a crisis as many other crises in the Middle East. It is a manifestation of a deep-rooted crisis. The

way in which Ein El-Helweh is being used is an example. It is being used to bring about the cover-up that Israel wants for its annexationist policies throughout—in the West Bank, in Gaza, in the Golan Heights, in Jerusalem. All these constitute elements of an ideology that is bent on expansion, that seeks to deflect the opinion of the world community from the facts of its aggression, expansion and annexation.

139. It asks the world community—and we have been asked this repeatedly: Why does the world community, especially the Arab States, not recognize the right of Israel to exist? I am going to answer this question, because we have in many instances been deflected from the real essence of the problem by the attempts to masquerade under a show of concern and to blow issues up out of all proportion. We ask those who ask us that question: Which Israel are they asking the Arab States to recognize? Which Israel are we asked to acknowledge?

140. Here we have a situation where the Israeli delegation and the Israeli State assume that East Jerusalem is part of the capital of Israel. Are we asked to recognize that as a fact? Are we asked to recognize the settlements in the West Bank and Gaza? What are those settlements for except to serve as a prelude to annexation? What is the purpose of the settlements in the Golan Heights and the so-called annexation of the Golan Heights as part of Israel? When does Israel intend to withdraw from the south of Lebanon as has been dictated by the Security Council? Which Israel are we asked to recognize?

141. We have also been told several times that it is important that the Arab States negotiate with Israel, that they sit down with it around the table—words that are acceptable in form but are very dangerous in substance. Negotiate what? We in the Arab States are eager to negotiate. We want to negotiate, but not to ratify conquests, not to ratify annexation, not to ratify hegemony by military Israel in the occupied territories.

142. They tell us not to set pre-conditions. Who has established the conditions? Who has annexed Jerusalem and declared it unilaterally, *ex cathedra*, as the capital of Israel? Who has claimed the right to establish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza in complete contravention of the articles of the Geneva Convention? Who is seeking to alter the demographic and geographic character of the West Bank and Gaza and in addition, as the representative of Lebanon has stated, of southern Lebanon? Who have arrogated to themselves the right to occupy and then never admit that it is occupation?

143. The whole world community, except Israel, recognizes that the West Bank and Gaza are occupied territories. Israel does not call them occupied territories or treat them as occupied territories: it treats them as arenas for the fulfilment of an expanded Israel. During the earlier period, they were called "administered territories". Then that term was abandoned by the Israeli lexicon. It became "territories"—nebulous, undetermined. Then, subsequently, it became "provinces"—Judea and Samaria—in preparation for the ultimate annexation.

144. Who is causing the continued disfranchisement of the Palestinian people? Who is causing the continued tension in the Golan Heights? Who is causing the continued tension on the internationally recognized borders of Lebanon? It is Israel's annexation of the Golan Heights, Israel's occupation of southern Lebanon, Israel's proliferation of settlements in the occupied territories, Israel's terrorism against the elected mayors of the various towns in the occupied territories.

145. We want to negotiate—of course we want to negotiate—but Palestinian rights are not negotiable; indeed, the international community has declared that there is such a thing as Palestinian rights. The integrity, unity, independence and total sovereignty of Lebanon are not negotiable because the Security Council has determined that Lebanon is entitled to the total restoration of its sovereignty over all its territory. Are the Golan Heights negotiable? The Council has determined that the Golan Heights are part and parcel of Syria.

146. Therefore we are confronted with an entity which refuses to spell out its parameters—which refuses to declare its borders. We are asked to recognize a State in a state of becoming. In fact we are asked to recognize a nucleus of an empire. We are asked to negotiate, not as a matter of achieving results and an outcome, which are acceptable and justifiable and legitimate; we are asked to be co-opted into a negotiating process that tends to ratify conquest and annexation. That aspect of negotiations is totally rejected.

147. From this posture of Israel's, its attempt at hegemony, its eagerness to establish itself as a centre for the feeding and arming of undercover activities in many parts of Central America and to support every coercive régime, we are faced with a situation whereby this Israel comes to the Council, insults its judgement, tries to deflect it from addressing the issues, introduces tangential issues in order to reduce the importance of Ein El-Helweh—in order to say that the Council is being preoccupied with a marginal, peripheral element in the Middle East equation—and has the temerity to state that the Council is not dealing with the central and more explosive issues in the Middle East.

148. Upon reflection and thorough examination, one must conclude that Israel constitutes the detonator of many of these crises, because if we look at the whole thrust and historical retrospect of what the Zionist ideology and the Israeli State since its inception have sought to create—a distortion whereby the distinction between one person and another is the ultimate ideological mystique, while notions of human integration are considered alien to its ideology—it becomes apparent that the whole Zionist ideology has been created

upon this basic philosophic perception. And in order to stimulate further disruptive forces in the region, it has sought to fan and elevate to a mystique certain religious differences, creating them as constants instead of variables, because it wanted to introduce into the whole lexicon and thought processes of the region a mirroring of its own ideology instead of the human integration that we have been seeking to achieve. Hence, when the Israeli representative states in the Council that the Arab world is not united, and therefore cannot be united, he is trying to project into the Arab human situation a reflection of the ideological anachronism that Israeli ideology represents.

149. Of course, the Arab world faces many problems. We have emerged from colonialism as separate entities because in the period of the colonial empires we were divided by many colonial countries which exercised different and varying degrees of colonial control over our destiny. We did not have the opportunity, historically speaking, to emerge into one national liberation movement, because we achieved our independence at different times, at different levels and against different colonial Powers. Yet when we achieved our independence we achieved it in order to formulate two basic legitimacies: the legitimacy of our sovereign States and the legitimacy of our Arab national consciousness. It is that attempt at historic reconciliation between the urge for our independence and sovereignty and the thrust of our Arab national consciousness and aspirations that has shaped the conduct of the League of Arab States.

150. We inherited social dislocations. Science, technology and the industrial revolution challenged the basic fabric of our society. It was a challenge that we tried to accommodate. Of course, there has been social, economic and political dislocation when, in our relationships with the industrial world, whether East or West, we have attempted to find answers to pressing problems. These critical problems in our society must elicit understanding, sympathetic responses and assistance.

151. Instead, Israel has sought to exploit the dislocations. Instead of facilitating the peace process, in accordance with various United Nations resolutions, it has targeted the Palestinians for permanent disfranchisement, and in the small country of Lebanon it has sought to settle major accounts in a small arena. Through the disfranchisement of the Palestinians, the annexation of the Golan Heights, the proliferation of settlements and the occupation of southern Lebanon, Israel has sought to stimulate destabilizing factors throughout the region, in order to arrogate to itself the right to complete military and strategic hegemony.

152. I do not want to dwell on the various plans that confirm many of the annexationist policies of Israel, nor to go into some slips of the tongue to give examples of the racist approach that has been taken by the Israelis towards Arab problems.

153. The Group of Arab States and the League of Arab States come to the United Nations because we believe, although there has not been enough evidence to that effect, that through the machinery of the Council it is possible to bring about a just and peaceful settlement, in accordance with the rights that have been spelt out to the Member States as well as to the people of Palestine. We come to the Council because of our belief in the supremacy of the political and diplomatic option, because we know that in the aftermath of the Second World War, and the devastation that took place, this remains the anchor for all those who have been disfranchised—their sole ray of hope that they will not be rendered, as the Palestinians are being rendered, helpless and desperate by an Israel that is defying all the resolutions of the Security Council and is in contempt of the Charter of the United Nations.

154. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

155. Mr. BLUM (Israel): As always, I benefit from the insights of Mr. Maksoud, and I listened attentively to his statement. I think it was towards the end of that statement that the root cause of the Arab-Israel conflict became very evident, when he described my country as one based on religious mystique. He and those for which he speaks simply cannot reconcile themselves to the notion that the Jewish people also is entitled to the right of self-determination, to the establishment of its own State, to sovereignty and independence. The age-long aspirations of the Jewish people to the exercise of self-determination in its country have been relegated by Mr. Maksoud to a religious mystique. This has been the root cause of the Arab-Israel conflict all these years, and this is why the countries for which Mr. Maksoud speaks have not been willing to sit down with us all these years, ever since the establishment of Israel in 1948.

156. To be sure—and I want to make this crystal-clear and to assure Mr. Maksoud of this—Israel's existence and right to exist are not predicated on his willingness to accord us such recognition. Israel's right to exist is as axiomatic as that of the various members of the League of Arab States or, for that matter, of any other State within the international community. But it is this unwillingness to come to terms with the right of the Jewish people to a State of its own, irrespective of boundaries and territory, that has lain at the root of the Arab-Israel conflict ever since 1948.

157. Mr. Maksoud tried to explain away this rejectionist posture by referring to Jerusalem, the Golan Heights and so on. What was the cause of his unwillingness to sit down and negotiate with Israel before 1967, before the Six-Day War, before Israel came to control East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights? There were various other excuses and pretexts at that time. The excuses vary; the root cause does not.

158. Therefore, we are treated to a strange logic which speaks of Israel as the nucleus of an empire—this coming from someone who speaks for 21 States extending over 5 million square miles, from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic, accusing of imperialism a State which is in control of less than 20,000 square miles, less than one half of 1 per cent of the territories of the Arab States, and about 70 per cent of that other major empire of our world, Switzerland! This is where a perversion of logic can lead one when one becomes blind to reality and is obsessed by one's own hatreds.

159. Once this situation is created it is, of course, perfectly possible to accuse Israel of every evil and all the malaise that prevails in the Middle East. Israel, of course, is responsible for the war between Iraq and Iran; Israel, of course, is responsible for the escalation of tension in the Persian Gulf; Israel is responsible for the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan; Israel is responsible for the tension between the two Yemens; Israel is responsible for the tension between the various Gulf States; Israel is responsible for the dispute between Iraq and Syria; Israel is responsible for the ongoing feuds between Syria and Jordan; Israel is responsible for the hostility of Libya towards everybody else—Libya against the Sudan, Libya against Chad, Libya against Tunisia, Libya against Egypt; Israel is responsible for the dispute in Western Sahara. I heard someone in the delegates gallery say "Yes". This is a new procedure. I should like to be enlightened, Mr. President, as to whether this is the procedure that we are supposed to—

160. The PRESIDENT: I ask the representative of Israel to address the Council also.

161. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I am addressing the Council, Mr. President.

162. With the kind of logic that I have described, everything becomes possible.

163. I must say I really have pity on Mr. Maksoud. He comes before the Council and is in a no-win situation, because he is faced with a dilemma. He has already treated us in the past to more than one exposé on that dilemma: should he come before the Council and thus devalue his appearances—which is why he appears so infrequently, I guess—or should he and the countries for which he speaks resort to non-diplomatic and non-political methods? These are the options; these are the alternatives.

164. It has not even occurred to Mr. Maksoud that his list is not exhaustive, and that there is a third way, which is, in fact, the civilized way which is being pursued by civilized nations world wide and which is the channel for achieving peace between warring nations: sitting down. He has tried to ridicule the notion of negotiations without preconditions; he spoke derisively about it. But that is how disputes have been solved world wide throughout the ages. That, however, is out of the question; it is not even being considered by Mr. Maksoud.

165. This is why I say, with all due respect, that I find his interventions, including his intervention of today, illuminating, and this is why I stated at the outset of my reply that, as always, I have today benefited from his insight and from his wisdom.

166. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer for the League of Arab States to the United Nations, has asked to make another statement. With the consent of the Council, I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

167. Mr. MAKSOUD: I was very hesitant about making a further statement, but I think certain issues of major importance have been raised and should not remain unanswered.

168. The Israeli representative has stated that the Jewish people have the right of self-determination. The issue is, how many of the Jewish people? There are Jews throughout the world, citizens integrated into their respective communities. What do we mean when we begin to classify religious identities throughout the world as the focus for the creation of a right of self-determination? This is a very important issue, because it sets in motion the establishment of very dangerous precedents, which would be destructive and unsettling, and could be the precursor of various alienations within a given body politic.

169. I am sure that the tragedies of anti-semitism, the pogroms and the results of the genocide in Nazi Germany have undoubtedly stimulated a measure of solidarity, leading—rightly or wrongly—to a desire for self-determination. But, if this notion of Jewish self-determination is absolute, continuous and universally applicable, that is a very new phenomenon. It is no longer confined to the notion of an Israeli State; it is the precursor of a right to self-determination which could mean, if all Jews are entitled to exercise self-determination and if they determine that they want to go to Israel, the nucleus of a much larger Israel than the one we are faced with today.

170. Irrespective of the philosophical connotations of this notion of zionism—which is challenged, by the way, by many hundreds of thousands of Jews everywhere in the world who consider it to be a destabilizing factor as regards their own sense of belonging as citizens in their respective countries—irrespective of the philosophical implications of this dangerous Zionist concept, we are saying that, if there is to be recognition of an Israel, it is important for the world community to spell out clearly the borders, the frontiers of that State.

171. Jewish people throughout the world are citizens of their respective countries—excellent citizens who do not presume that anti-semitism is a permanent feature

of human nature, but see it as an aberration that is transient, temporary and condemnable. But zionism, in the way it has been articulated today, presumes the permanency of anti-semitism, thus the permanency of Jewish alienation, and thus the necessity for self-determination. While the people of Palestine, disfranchised deliberately by conquest and by exclusion, are denied the right of self-determination—paradoxically. This is where right is subordinate to might.

172. The Israeli representative states that excuses vary, that Israel is in control of 20,000 square miles and that the Arab States are in control of 5 million square miles. That is the logic that the *apartheid* régime in South Africa applies and that the white settlers in Rhodesia applied. I suppose, by that logic, if 20,000 square miles is little compared with 5 million square miles, what is 30,000 square miles, what is 50,000 square miles, compared with 5 million? If all of them want self-determination in Israel, then what is another million square miles compared with the 4 million square miles of the Arabs?

173. It is unbelievable. I cannot believe that even an Israeli Zionist representative would utter such historical senselessness—I want to be very careful, so I avoided the word "nonsense".

174. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak a second time in exercise of the right of reply.

175. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I shall be very brief indeed.

176. I believe it has been very useful, again, to listen to the second statement of Mr. Maksoud, because I think it displayed his utter inability to countenance the notion of the existence of the Jewish people. That, as I claimed before, is really the fundamental problem: the inability of Mr. Maksoud and of those for whom he speaks to get accustomed to the idea that the Jews are also a people entitled to self-determination, sovereignty and independence like any other people. That inability has been the root cause of the Arab-Israel conflict—before 1967, since 1967, all these years.

177. I should very much hope that anti-semitism is indeed a transient phenomenon, as we have been promised by Mr. Maksoud. It has been rather persistent over the years, but I am sure that Mr. Maksoud will do his very best to see to it that those countries for which he speaks will not engage in anti-semitism in the United Nations, as some members of the League of Arab States have done over the past few years, from the rostrum of the General Assembly, in the Security Council and elsewhere. For instance, Mr. Treiki, who has since been elevated to the rank of Minister for Foreign Affairs of his country and who is well known for his expertise in the field of diplomatic immunity, made a vulgar anti-Semitic attack on the Jews of New York last December in the General Assembly. And I am not aware of Mr. Treiki's having been rebuked by Mr. Maksoud and having been told by him that he should not engage in "transient phenomena". Other Arab representatives from Syria, Jordan and other countries have likewise been engaged in such anti-Semitic rhetoric in this building. I would very much hope that from now on, since Mr. Maksoud has decreed that anti-semitism is a transient phenomenon, he will see to it that the members of the League of Arab States refrain from this kind of rhetoric.

178. The State of Israel is a State of a people like any other people, and it is time to wake up, Mr. Maksoud, and realize that fact. But as I look around the world, to my astonishment, I see a number of countries that in their official designation insist on being called the adherents of a certain religion. There are a number of States that insist on being called Islamic republics. But that has nothing to do with religion. I even know of States whose very establishment is based on religion. If Mr. Maksoud is interested, I could provide him with a list of such States. It is not the State of Israel.

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.

NOTES

[1] Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973).

[2] United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21, chap. I, sect. A.

[3] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138.